

February 20, 1975

be brought out. We're not trying to tie the parents down, as Senator Fowler and Senator Cavanaugh tried to let you believe. We're not trying to make it as strict as they are saying. We're saying that in here that sometimes the parents problems contribute to the child's problems. Sometimes they feel that the parents should bear some of the responsibility for change along with the child. Now to let them tell you that they are going to say that the courts are going to come down and sentence everyone of these cases, is ridiculous, and you know that, and I don't want you to believe it. I think another thing that you should really be concerned with, something they failed to mention yesterday, was the fact that the parent does not have to agree to these conditions, they can let the child be put in an institution. Senator Rasmussen said it was against the parents. Well I think we all disagree. I think it's for the parents as well as the children. Senator Rasmussen should know, and I'm sure he does, that if the parents do not wish to have any of these conditions to keep the child at home, he can release him and he can say I don't want to do that. The child can then be put in a foster home or somewhere else. So I think it's a bill that gives the parents a lot of weight. It gives them an opportunity, a second chance. It also gives the young people a chance to stay at home. Therefore I would renew, as I have not seen any amendments from any of these people that proposed amendments yesterday. There is no doubt they'll try something else. I think we should pay attention to who is going to try it. Therefore, I would still move for the advancement of LB 290 as amended.

CLERK: Mr. President, we have a motion on the desk to bracket LB 290 until February 27th. Signed, Senator Fowler.

SPEAKER: Senator Fowler.

SENATOR FOWLER: OK. Could I change that to the 25th. Senator Barnett asked that. Mr. Speaker, members of the Legislature, the reason I'd like to have this bracketed is that I think some questions were raised yesterday about the full impact of the bill. I'm sorry that overnight I did not come up with amendments to put restrictions on this. I think it's a very broad grant of authority to the courts. I think we've seen in other cases that we need much more precise due process procedures. We have several bills dealing from teacher contracts to parole board and things like that to provide those sorts of procedures. As the bill is now it makes no reference to the type of offense. The court could get involved in a family, whether it's a question of truancy or a question of a serious theft, or something of that sort. It seems that there needs to be restrictions in that. I think there needs to be an opportunity, perhaps, for the parents to be able to negotiate with the court. Right now they are given the choice of accepting the courts dictate or losing their child, which I think is a very very definite type of blackmail that the court has. I think there should be some more procedures there. I do not have any